

APPLICATION NO.

10/769,667

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

FILING DATE

01/30/2004

10/06/2004

7590

1 S 376 Summit Ave., Court C Oakbrook Terrace, IL 60181

James N. Videbeck Patnaude & Videbeck UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
	8552
EXAM	INER

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

ART UNIT

3671

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR

Allen D. Siblik

		Application No.		Applicant(s)			
Office Action Commence		10/769,667		SIBLIK, ALLEN D	).	B	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit			
		Alexandra K Pechhol		3671			
- Period for	- The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	pears on the cover she	eet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress		
THE N - Extens after S - If the p - If NO - Failure Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute sply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, r y within the statutory minimum will apply and will expire SIX (6 c, cause the application to beco	may a reply be tim of thirty (30) days MONTHS from to ome ABANDONE	ely filed s will be considered timel the mailing date of this co O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 Ja</u>	anuary 2004.					
2a) <u></u> □	2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
3)□ :							
(	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositio	on of Claims						
4)	Claim(s) is/are pending in the application.						
4	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)🛛	5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>16-18</u> is/are allowed.						
·	6) Claim(s) <u>1,2,4 and 5</u> is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) 3,6-15 is/are objected to.					•	
8)[_] (	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requiremen	nt.				
Application	on Papers						
9)□ T	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correc				• •	•	
11)1	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the atta	ached Office	Action or form P1	TO-152.		
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:			-(d) or (f).			
	1. Certified copies of the priority document			an No			
	<ul><li>2. Certified copies of the priority document</li><li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority</li></ul>		•		Stage		
•	application from the International Burea	•		u in uns Nauonai	Stage		
* Se	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list			d.			
		·					
Attachment(	•	, <b>.</b>		(DTO 445)			
	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		view Summary ( er No(s)/Mail Da				
3) Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	· -	ce of Informal Part.	atent Application (PTC	D-152)		

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Attwood (US 3,617, 076).

Regarding claim 1, Attwood discloses an articulated reflector comprising:

- a base, seen as barrier (14) in Figs. 1 and 2, including means for retaining
  the base on standard guardrail mounting bolts, disclosed by Attwood in
  column 2, lines 21-23 in that the barrier (14) is in turn supported by being
  fastened to posts by suitable means such as bolts,
- a reflector mounting member, seen as tab (17) or tab (19), including
  means for mounting reflective mea thereon, disclosed by Attwood in
  column 1, lines 49-53 in that the surfaces of the tabs can be coated with a
  material for reflecting light, and
- resilient L-shape spring steel member, seen as fastening device (10) (Col
   2, lines 30-32 disclose that device (10) is made from spring steel), defining substantially identical mounting portions oriented about 90 degrees from each other and joined by a bight portion therebetween, seen in Figs. 1 and

2 as the somewhat horizontal portion of device (10) and the vertical portion of device (10).

Regarding claim 2, the barrier (14) is selectably releasably mounted to the device (10), since they can be separated or adjusted by bolts (56).

Regarding claim 4, the barrier (14) is disclosed as being made of metal, like the tabs (17, 19) of the fastening device (1).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Attwood (US 3,617, 076). Attwood fails to disclose the base and reflector mounting member being made of plastic, instead disclosing them as made of metal. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the material of the base and reflector mounting member of Attwood to be plastic, since plastic is commonly used, economical, strong, and durable, and furthermore it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

# Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claims 3 and 6-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 6. Claims 16-18 are allowed.

#### Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexandra Pechhold whose telephone number is (703) 305-0870. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs. from 8:00am to 5:30pm and alternating Fridays from 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas B. Will, can be reached on (703)308-3870. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Inomas B. Will
Supervisory Patent Examiner

AKP 9/25/04